Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

(1)

97 • 325 MAY 27 1997

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
No.

In The

SUPREME COURT of the UNITED STATES

October Term 1997

Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per

Petitioner

v.

PaineWebber Incorporate

Respondent

On Petition For Writ of Cetiorari

To The United States Ninth Appellate Court

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per
329 Parkview Circle
Taft, California 93268
Phone: 805 763 1882

---

69 PP

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Isn't it unconstitutional and against the constitution of the United States of America for the NASD arbitration's arbitrators to rule alive claims filed with the NASD arbitration as stale and for the NASD arbitration arbitrators to deprive victims of criminal conduct of receiving justice because the National Association of Securities Dealers Arbitration does not need to conform with the "statute laws," being the governing laws of our society?

2. Isn't it against the Rules of Fair Practice of the NASD arbitration and the constitution of this United States that a NASD arbitrator's very fraudulent ruling deprives victims of a corporate criminal from receiving any justice for vile, deliberate crimes done to the victim by a corporate criminal who violates the laws governing their business?

3. Isn't it against the laws for a corporate criminal to demand NASD arbitration with a petition to a federal court inorder to use NASD arbitration for promoting the criminal conduct of the dishonest corporation for depriving victims of the corporation of their legal right to be protected by the laws that govern that corporations business?

4. Shouldn't a ruling of claims as being alive by the United States Ninth Appellate Court in a U. S. Federal Ninth Circuit Court memorandum filed November 8, 1993 pertaining to claims that is court record NO. 40 of CV F 90 450 REC. confirming that Painewebber Inc. VIOLATED securities laws of the state of California with me BE SUFFICIENT TO OVERRULE a fraudulent decision of any NASD arbitrators who were most probably bought by Painewebber Inc. for the purpose of defrauding me?

5. Does the CONSTITUTION allow the NASD arbitration to continually defy and ignore the written LAW

& LEGAL statute of laws applying to the crimes filed with the NASD arbitration against a corporate criminals?

6. Is the United States supreme Court aware that the laws are allowing criminals to use arbitration for the promotion of their crimes with the public?

7. Is the United States Supreme Court aware that the NASD arbitration is fraudulently dismissing very alive claims filed with the NASD arbitration as being stale in favor of vile corporate criminals who deliberately violate our laws and who motion the NASD arbitration that the very alive claims filed with the NASD arbitration which are mandated by law only to be heard with the NASD and filed with the NASD arbitration legally waiting to be heard with the NASD arbitration are being fraudulently dismissed as "stale" because the corporate criminal is allowed to use the NASD arbitration for depriving their victims of receiving any justice for the vile, deliberate crimes of the corporate criminal?

8. Does the 1987 Mc Mahon Decision allow the NASD arbitration to fraudulently dismiss alive claims and defraud people fall within the legal boundaries of our Constitution and deprive those mandated by law to file the criminal acts of dishonest brokerages with NASD arbitration?

9. Shouldn't it be very very unconstitutional for the NASD arbitration arbitrators to use a different statute of laws for ruling claims filed with the NASD as being alive or stale than the lawful written statutes written in the legal books of law governing the laws of our country?

10. Is the U. S. Supreme Court aware that the Federal Arbitration Act is being used by corporate criminals who have arbitration clauses for avoiding prosecution from our courts for serious deliberate crimes done to victims by these vile corporate criminals?

11. Because the NASD arbitration dismissed Painewebber's March 1, 1991 discovery day crimes of FRAUD the breaches of fiduciaries crimes with the March 1, 1991 discovery day as stale from March 15, 1991 NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 on December 9, 1991 AS BEING STALE does this fact confirm that all NASD arbitration claims filed with the NASD arbitration inorder to be LEGAL FOR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS when filed with NASD arbitration must be filed with the NASD arbitration before 15 days from the time of discovery has lapsed or the claim will be rules as "STALE" and dead by the NASD arbitration?

12. Can the NASD arbitration legally and lawfully dismiss any claims filed with the NASD arbitration as being "STALE" when the laws of our land that are written governing the CRIME filed with the NASD arbitration confirm the claims filed with the NASD were filed within the proper statute of limitations in OUR courts of law?

13. Is the U. S. Supreme Court aware that Painewebber Inc. uses the NASD arbitration for HAVING persons fraudulently and unlawfully CONVICTED of being a VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS that want a HEARING on alive claims filed with the NASD arbitration that according to California state laws and federal laws are very alive claims of the state of California and federal government filed with the NASD arbitration?

14. Is the Supreme Court aware that Painewebber Inc. uses the NASD arbitration for receiving money from those who they violate in the form of sanctions being granted to Painewebber for depriving their victims of a hearing on Painewebber crimes that Painewebber Inc. did not want heard with the NASD arbitration?

15. Is Painewebber Inc. allowed by law to set to motion in a court of law CLAIMS mandated by law ONLY to be heard in arbitration FILED with the NASD arbitration?

16. Is Painewebber allowed to set to motion in a California state court ANY Painewebber VERY ALIVE crimes filed with the NASD arbitration as required by ALL laws ALSO being very alive PaineWebber CRIMES that the NASD arbitration has scheduled for hearing with the NASD inorder that Painewebber can claim "res judicata"?

17. Is Painewebber Inc. allowed to set to motion in a court of law CLAIMS mandated by law and a FEDERAL COURT ORDER only to be heard in arbitration?

18. Is Painewebber Inc. allowed by law to deprive any person of a hearing on any very alive Painewebber Inc. crime of the Federal Government or the State of California filed with the NASD arbitration that Painewebber Inc. does not want heard at the NASD arbitration?

19. Shouldn't the court intervene and make a just ruling that conforms with our laws for those persons who have been forced by law to take the crimes of criminal Painewebber Inc. to the NASD arbitration against their good judgment but have filed with the NASD arbitration because of the laws mandating arbitration for CRIMES and then deprived of justice at the NASD arbitration for crimes that according to OUR lands written lawful statute of limitations are very alive CRIMES for the crimes that pertain to the crimes according to our written laws of the state of California and Federal laws governing the crimes?

20. Can Painewebber be in contempt of court and set to motion for hearing in a court of law any NASD arbitration filed Painewebber Inc. crime or crimes prior to the legal lawful written dismissal of that NASD arbitration claim where by law all the claims are filed being CRIMES

Painewebber Inc. petitioned & mandated the federal court to ORDER all Painewebber's crimes heard ONLY in arbitration because of PWI's arbitration clause in PWI's contract that MANDATED Painewebber's crimes can only be heard in arbitration?

21. Can Painewebber claim RES JUDICATA by being in CRIMINAL contempt of court by unlawfully setting to motion claims filed for hearing with the NASD arbitration in a court of law before NASD arbitration dismissal?

22. Can Painewebber "say" to the NASD arbitration that Painewebber wants Painewebber's crimes filed with NASD arbitration heard in a court of law inorder to defraud someone who Painewebber has violated?

23. Can a brokerage corporation violate their clients agreement contract to use the mandatory arbitration clause for CRIME and for violating civil rights laws?

24. Is Painewebber Inc. allowed by law to announce at the NASD arbitration that Painewebber will take care of their vile California crimes that are filed with the NASD arbitration scheduled for hearing with the NASD arbitration in a California state court inorder to have somebody convicted of being as a vexatious litigant?

25. When Painewebber PUBLICLY ANNOUNCE on November 20, 1991 at NASD arbitration 91 00986 that Painewebber wanted Painewebber's California crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 heard in California state court was Painewebber Inc. violating the Federal Arbitration ACT?

26. When the NASD arbitration heard and knew that Painewebber Inc. announced publicly on November 20, 1991 that Painewebber wanted Painewebber's California crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 heard i

in California state court should the NASD arbitration move Painewebber's crimes filed with the NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 to California state court or should BY LAW Painewebber have moved their VERY ALIVE crimes filed with the NASD arbitration to California state court?

27. When Painewebber told me and NASD arbitration on Nov. 20, 1991 that Painewebber wanted their California crimes heard in California state court was PaineWebber using the Federal Arbitration Act for CRIMES?

28. Shouldn't the NASD arbitrators of NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 be libel for part of the many costs of Painewebber's crimes remaining in our court system for years longer than should have been necessary because of NASD's involvement with Painewebber defrauding me and NASD's failure of properly moving Painewebber's very alive NASD arbitration filed crimes to the California state court system and not fraudulently dismissing PWI's very very alive California crimes filed unlawfully as being STALE inorder that Painewebber would use the process of law for the promotion of PWI crimes for corrupting our justice system for the next six years?

29. Isn't Painewebber a felon for taking commission money from my Painewebber account UNLAWFULLY by defrauding me?

30. When Painewebber publicly announced on Nov. 20, 1991 at NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 that Painewebber wanted Painewebber's VERY ALIVE California crimes heard in California state court for the purpose of claiming "stale", "res judicata" and "vague" was Painewebber Inc. in criminal contempt of court in Kern County Superior Court and using the Federal Arbitration Act for crimes?

31. Can Painewebber Inc. deprive any of their victims of justice legally using the Federal Arbitration Act unlawfully for the promotion of their vile, deliberate crimes?

32. Can Painewebber use the NASD arbitration for the crimes of getting money in the form of sanctions from those who they deprive of a hearing on their crimes?

33. Can Painewebber Inc. viciously deprive anyone from having a hearing on any very very alive Painewebber crimes because Painewebber Inc. has deliberately corrupted the process of law?

34. Can a Painewebber lawyer legally motion for dismissing very very alive Federal and California Painewebber crimes filed with the NASD arbitration and get the crimes dismissed by "paying" or "buying" the NASD arbitrators to dismiss ALIVE legally filed Painewebber Inc. crimes filed with NASD arbitration from the NASD arbitration which are mandated by law only to be heard in arbitration?

35. Isn't it unconstitutional for the NASD arbitration to deprive any person of justice for the crimes of a dishonest brokerage because the dishonest brokerage demands that the many alive crimes claims filed with a NASD arbitration claim legally and being crimes that are very alive must be dismissed from the NASD arbitration?

36. Was the purpose of enacting the Federal Arbitration Act inorder that CRIMINALS could evaid our laws using arbitrators who would fraudulently dismiss alive claims as being stale when the claims filed with the arbitration are very alive claims according to federal and state law statutes?

37. Can the NASD arbitration discriminate against people in PRO PER because the NASD arbitration must HATE persons in PRO PER who file claims against a dishonest brokerage corporation who supports their organization?

38. Can a dishonest brokerage corporation who has an arbitration clause in their contract for arbitrating their crimes with NASD arbitration file motions with courts for demanding NASD arbitration for their crimes for SIX years demanding that ONLY by law their crimes CAN ONLY be heard with the NASD arbitration and MANDATING NASD arbitration for SIX years before the court has any authority to STOP granting corporate criminals with arbitration clauses arbitration for crimes that need to be prosecuted by a court?

39. Will the United States Supreme Court make a law that will HELP victims of criminal brokerages with arbitration clauses in their contracts to be able to receive some justice and NOT be forced by law to take CRIMES to arbitration?

40. CV F 90 450 REC. is filed under the protection of S.E.C. Rule "ii64" being a Securities and Exchange Ruling that I was lead to believe GAVE the United States Federal Distinct Court jurisdiction for hearing and prosecuting Painewebber Inc.'s federal securities crimes and other serious gross crimes, does S.E.C. Rule "ii64" give the United States Supreme Court also jurisdiction for hearing and finalizing Painewebber's crimes done to me?

41. Is it a duty of the U. S. Supreme Court to disbar lawyers who have failed to abide with proper RULES of ethics and standards demanded by the legal profession?

42. Isn't it true that only those lawyers who have the highest moral and ethical character are allowed to come before the United States Supreme court?

43. Would the U. S. Supreme Court Justices allow any person who lacked creditability to come before them?

44. Can corporations have lawyers whoes CONDUCT when practicing law does not comply with standards of those set in the American Bar Association's book of rules?

45. Is what I read TRUE that the American Bar Association's code of ethics laws governing lawyers demands them to certain standards of conduct when the lawyer has any dealings with a preson not represented by one of the legal profession?

46. Are Painewebber's lawyers allowed to deprive me of justice by using our laws unlawfully for causing gross errors in our courts?

47. PaineWebber's lawyers Mr. Scott M. Ratchick, Ms Catherine J. Pratt and Ms Judy Louis has each filed LEGAL DOCUMENTS in OUR courts of law with me that were filed by Painewebber Inc. to degrade the dignity of law and obstruct justice because THEY each have uses the process of law unlawfully ARE the three Painewebber lawyers assigned to my claims against Painewebber suitable lawyers to be appearing infront of the United States Supreme Court?

48. Is the United States Supreme Court aware that the three Painewebber lawyers assigned to my claims has each LIED?

49. Is the United states Supreme Court going to disbar the Painewebber lawyers assigned to my claims?

50. Is Painewebber's Consumers' Affairs Department allowed by law to do COVER UP investigations into problems that Painewebber may have?

51. Is PaineWebber ALLOWED to LIE to the S. E. C. in LETTERS such as they did on November 25, 1991 to Ms Janis A. Leyden of the S.E.C. in Los Angeles?

52. Have the Justices of the United States Supreme court read PaineWebber's letter to Ms Janis A. Leyden of the Securities and Exchange Commission dated November 25, 1991 that is California COURT RECORD FO18582 companion case excert of records page 312 - 313?

53. Is Painewebber Inc.'s MAIN Corporate Executive Office Mr. Donald Marron by law allowed to INSTRUCT Painewebber's Consumers Affairs Department to do cover up investigations? California COURT RECORD FO 18582 companion case excerts of record page 296.

54. Is the personal PROPERTY INFORMATION of a person whom Painewebber has defrauded a DEFENSE for Painewebber justifying Painewebber's crimes?

55. Shouldn't is be unlawful for a lawyer to file a motion in a court of law like Painewebber Inc. did on June 30, 1992 in Kern County Superior that unconstitutionally has a person declared as a vexatious litigant wrongfully?

56. Did Painewebber commit a felony on June 30, 1992 in Kern County Superior Court by filing legal documents in the court that violated my civil and legal rights done by Painewebber for unlawfully receiving MONEY in the form of sanctions for MAKING me a victims of their CRIMES?

57. Was Painewbber comitting FRAUD and violating the laws of California on July 1, 1992 when Kern County Superior Court filed Painewebber's June 30, 1992 dated

docquments that were for DEFRAUDING the court and ME using the court for CRIME of PaineWebber violating civil rights laws and comitting fraud at the Kern County Superior Court, Bakersfield, California in July 1992?

58. Can a Painewebber Inc. lawyer use a California court for filing legal documents which are unconstitutional?

59. Can Painewebber insert the word "it" in a letter written to them by ME and use the letter in a United States Federal court as a true legal docqument?

60. Can a Painewebber lawyer use the federal mail for serving legal documents to a court of law that are UNLAWFUL TO FILE IN A COURT OF LAW because the legal docquments violate civil rights laws?

61. Is Painewebber Incorporate a brokerage corporation THAT YOU consider as being a reputable place of business that does business honestly with the public?

62. Can Painewebber legally motion to a court for Painewebber to receive sanctions from a court of law from a party who Painewebber has violated without BREAKING our laws?

63. When Painewebber petitioned the Federal District Court in October 1994 inorder for the NASD arbitration to validate the legality of the statute of limitations on the Federal Securities Claim against PaineWebber ruled reversed and remanded back to the district by the Ninth Appellate Court on Nov. 1, 1993 was Painewebber making a frivolous motion?

64. Can lawyers of those who violate our laws file a motion against a person who the corporation has violated

for receiving money in the form of "sanctions" from a party that Painewebber has deprived of a legal right such as Painewebber's lawyers have done?

65. Does the U. S. Supreme Court think that the state of California has good cause to SUE Painewebber for what they did in Kern County Superior Court?

66. Does the U. S. Supreme Court think the NASD arbitration should take action against Painewebber Inc. for using arbitration unlawfully?

67. Does the U. S. Supreme Court think that the FEDERAL court should send Painewebber a very big BILL for using up their time foolishly and wasting the lives of everyone and our time for OVER the past seven years?

68. My claims against Painewebber Inc. filed in California state court for violating California contract laws and other California laws and My claims filed in U. S. Federal Court for violating federal securities laws and FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS laws are ALL civil criminal complaint law suit claims filed BY me against PaineWebber Inc. for violating LAWS governing their business with ME a true FACT that every claim reveals and known to ALL courts where Painewebber's crimes are filed; will the Supreme Court please tell me WHY arbitration was granted to PaineWebber for their federal securities crimes by the Federal District Court on October 2, 1990 when the Federal District Court knew FOR SURE that the July 17, 1990 Federal Securities Fraud claim CV F 90 450REC. I filed was a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against Painewebber for CRIMES of federal securities fraud?

69. Does the U. S. Supreme Court condone Painewebber LYING to the Securities and Exchange and the Nebraska Banking Authorities concerning their undeniable unlawful business practices done to me, a person of the public?

70. Will the U. S. Supreme Court give me and my family some justice for the YEARS of HELL that Painewebber has forced our family to endure?

71. Will the justices of the U. S. Supreme Court use my case against Painewebber Inc. a purpose in making NEW laws that will correct some of the "PITFALLS" in contracts containing arbitration clauses with employers, employees and persons of the public who have a contract containing an arbitration clauses that deprives the victims of criminal acts to be forced by law to take the crimes of probable criminals and violators of our laws to an arbitration forum?

72. Will the court make a retroactive law granting any victims of a criminal acts who HAVE been forced to take the criminal act of a violator of our laws to an arbitration forum because of a clause in a contract with the violator the legal right GRANTING all victims the right to take the act of crime to a court of law where the criminal act can be prosecuted?

73. Will the court MAKE a law that reinstates all claims dismissed fraudulently by an arbitration forum that did not conform with the writen laws governing our land and dismissed claims in violation with our written laws that these ALIVE CLAIM for the crimes of CRIMINALS with arbitration clauses in their contracts are prosecuted by a court of law?

74. Is PaineWebber Incorporate allowed to use the SAME certified mail number TWICE when sending certified mail to anyone for use in a court of law?

75. Are the U. S. Supreme Court Justices aware that there are a great number of persons whoes rights to be protected by the laws are deprived because of laws allowing criminals to hide their crimes behind the door of an arbitration forum?

LIST OF PARTIES

PETITIONER/APPELLANT

Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per.....an individual with no corporations or subsiduaries inviolved.

The Solicitor General of the United States Department of Justice

The Attorney General of the State of California and the California Department of Justice

The Federal Bureau of Investigation

The Securities & Exchange Commission of the United States

The California State of Corporations

The Nebraska Department of Justice

The Nebraska Department of Banking & Finance

The National Association of Securities Dealers Arbitration

The Kern County District Courts

The California Fifth District Appellate Court

The California Supreme Court

The U. S. Federal Eastern District Court of California

The U. S. Ninth Circuit Appellate Court

RESPONDENTS/APPELLEE

Painewebber Inc..... a corporation with the following parents, subsidiaries and affiliates,

RESPONDENTS/APPELLEE

Painewebber Inc..... a corporation with the following parents, subsidiaries and affiliates,

PaineWebber Inc. Group, Inc.
PaineWebber International Bank, LTD.
PaineWebber International (UK), LTD.
Mitchell Hutchins Asset Management Inc.
Mitchell Hutchins International Investors Inc.
PaineWebber Capitol Inc.
Paine Webber Development Corporation
PaineWebber Properties Incorporate
PaineWebber Trust Corporation
PaineWebber Specialists Inc.
PaineWebber Life Insurance Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Questions	i
List of Parties	xiv
Table of Contents	xvi
Table of Appendix	xvii
List of Citations & Authorities	ixx
Petition of Writ of Certiorari	1
U. S. Supreme Court Has Jurisdiction Over These Cases, Rules 10, 11 & 28 USCA 2101 (e) apply	1
1. Statement of Jurisdiction	2
2. Statement of Cases	5
A. Dec. 5, 1994	20
B. PWI MADE A CONTRACT	21
C. FACTS	22
1. PWI uses arbitration for crimes ...	22
2. NASD is promoting crimes	22
3. Painewebber uses MAIL for crime	23
4. Painewebber LIES continually	23
5. PWI does cover up investigations	23

		Page
6.	PWI corporate officers ARE party	23
	D. I have been denied justice	24
3.	Reasons for Granting Petition	27
	Relief Requested	29

TABLE OF APPENDIX

Page

Appendix a ..... Ninth Circuit Appellate Court
Nov. 8, 1993 filed 92 16 894
Memorandum for CV F 90 450 REC. ..... 1 a

Appendix b ..... Ninth Circuit Appellate Court
June 28, 1994 filed 93 16337
Memorandum for CV F 93 5370 REC. ..... 8 a

Appendix c ..... Ninth Circuit Appellate Court
October 17, 1994 filed 93 16337
Order for June 8, 1993 filed CIVIL RIGHTS claim
for unconstitutionally having me convicted
Unconstitutionally being a vexatious
litigant & sanctioned UNCONSTITUTIONALLY to
pay the criminal PaineWebber Inc. BIG money for
being dishonest, claim CV F 93 5370 REC. .... 11 a

Appendix d .... CA 5 District Appellate Court-
OPINION (suitable for publiishing) filed Oct. 27, 1994,
CA 5th Appellate case FO 18582 for June 22, 1990 filed
CA Civil Code of Proceedure Section 337 four (4) year
statute of limitations claim 220662 against Painewebber
for writing unlawful sales contracts in CA and gross failure
to conduct business AS allowed by law and PaineWebber's
continual failure to monitor an office and employees who
Painewebber knew needed MONITORING. .... 12 a

Page

Appendix e ..... Ninth Circuit Appellate Court
Feb. 20, 1997, 1997 filed 96 16169
Memorandum 7/17/90 filed CV F 90 450 REC. 14a

Appendix f .... Ninth Circuit Appellate Court
April 10, 1997 filed 96 16169
Order for 7/17/90 filed FEDERAL SECURITIES FRAUD
claim CV F 90 450 REC ..... 17 a

CITATIONS & AUTHORITIES

A. G. Edward and Son Inc. v. Mc Collough
967 f . 2d 1401, 1402, (9th Cir 1992) (per curiam)

Robuck v. Dean Witter and Co.
649 f . 2d 641, 644 (1980)

Davis v. Burr Wilson & Co.
839 f . 2d 1369, 1369 - 70
(9th Cir 1988)

Sheet Metal Workers Int'l Ass'n Local Union 359
v. Madison Indus.,
84 f .3d 1186, 1190 (9th Cir. 1996)

Miller v. Maxwell's Int'l Inc.,
991 f . 2d 583, 585. (9th Cir 1993)

Rose v. United States
905 f . 2d 1257, 1259. (9th Cir. 1990)

CONSTITUTION of the UNITED STATES

CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE OF PROCEEDURE
SECTION 337 and 338 (4)

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT under 42 USCS
Civil Rights Action for Deprevation of Rights

Congress enacted section 27 A of
15 U S C section 78 aa - 1

Federal Deposit Insurance Act 12/19/91 .....Section 476,

Securities & Exchange 10 "b" Rules

FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1985

Federal Civil rights Act under USCS "Conspiracies"

"Equal protection of the laws"..... Section 264

"Right to be free of conspiracies"..... Section 265

28 USCA Section 2403 (a) & (b)

28 USCA Section 2101

28 USCA Section 1651 (a)

U. S. Supreme Court Rule "20"

U. S. Supreme Court Rule "10" (a) & (c)

U. S. Supreme Court Rule "11"

Federal District Court Rule "11"

California Civil Code of Proceedure Section 128.5

28 USCA Section 1253

28 USCA Section 1254

Federal Arbitration Act TITLE 9 USCA Sections 1 thro- 14

CIVIL RIGHTS under 42 USCS

"Color of the law"GENERAL .....Section 56

"Federal Civil Rights Act" ..... Section 59

FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS ACT of 1983

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The U. S. Supreme Court has jurisdiction over this case because the Federal Arbitration is being used for the promotion of the crimes of corporate criminals with arbitration clauses.

Dishonest corporations are making contracts containing arbitration clauses with their victims inorder to deprive their victims of their CIVIL RIGHT of being allowed to be protected by our laws that govern the business of dishonest corporations who do not conduct their business with the public according to the laws that govern the corporation's business.

Legal documents filed with MY claims against Painewebber Inc. contain undeniable facts of vicious crimes and GROSSLY vicious dishonest conduct done by Painewebber continually to me for depriving ME my civil and legal rights given to me by the Constitution.

All letters, documents, memo's, teleconferences, transcripts, being all of everything that was ever filed in the courts against Painewebber and BOTH NASD 91 00986 and NASD 95 00357 arbitration claims apply including the October 4, 1991 NASD 91 00986 teleconference with Painewebber and the NASD arbitration are for the United States Supreme Court records for reviewing the CRIMES done to me; everything ever filed anywhere applies to this Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per vs. Painewebber Incorporate CRIMINAL case for the U. S. Supreme Court records.

U. S. Supreme Court Rules 10, 11 and 28 USCA 2101 (e) apply because I petitioned for right for Writ of Certiorari in September 1994 to the varying courts where Painewebber's crimes are filed because the GROSS CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS were continually done to me.

1. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per on September 12, 1994 wrote legal letters to all the appellate courts where Painewebber's crimes are filed for permission for the right to Petition for Writ of Certiorari, this is a fact of truth that on September 12, 1994 I requested permission of ALL the appellate courts where Painewebber's crimes are filed telling the each of the courts that I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per wanted Painewebber's crimes of violating CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS filed with the United States Supreme Court for hearing because of the very egregious nature of Painewebber's very many civil rights crimes done to me.

On October 24, 1994 I filed legally an appeal with the U. S. Ninth Appellate Court for the order of October 17, 1994 for 6/8/93 filed MY civil rights claim against criminal Painewebber Inc. for their crime of unconstitutionally having me convicted of being a vexatious litigant on September 1, 1992; on June 8, 1993 I filed the Civil Rights claim CV F 93 5370 REC. against Painewebber Inc. for unlawfully having me convicted of being a VEXATIOUS litigant 9/1/92 and SANCTIONED by the court to pay Painewebber BIG BUCKS for being a CRIMINAL who deprived me of my civil rights to be protected by the laws of OUR land; these Painewebber Incorporate crimes have a September 1, 1992 discovery day, being the day that the criminal Painewebber had the court unlawfully have me convicted of being a vexatious litigant and sanctioned by the court to pay the criminal Painewebber Inc. big money for depriving me of MY legal rights to be protected by the laws of OUR land ALL being another serious CRIME to add to all the other vicious crimes done to me by the CRIMINAL Painewebber Inc. .

October 19, 1994 Painewebber filed a motion with the United States District Court unlawfully STAYING ALL MY CLAIMS depriving me not to be able to go forward with the September 12, 1994 REQUEST of mine for filing for WRIT of Certiorari sent to the appellate courts where Painewebbers CRIMES were filed on 9/12/94 asking them for the right to have Painewebber's crimes heard with the United States Supreme Court for being finalized.

September 12, 1994 I wrote the letters to the appellate court requesting permission for the RIGHT TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI because I thought that Painewebber Inc.'s crimes of using mandatory arbitration laws and their Painewebber arbitration clause in Painewebber's contract called "Clients Agreement" for depriving PWI VICTIMS of their right to be protected by our laws was such a very egregious vicious PWI crime I knew should only be addressed in the very HIGHEST court of our land for the safety of our people.

Painewebber Inc. uses their arbitration clause in their "Clients Agreement" contract with their VICTIMS inorder to avoid prosecution for THEIR deliberate crimes by demanding the court MUST grant them arbitration for deliberate crimes done to their victims because the clause in Painewebber's "Clients Agreement" contract by law grants Painewebber Inc. the legal right for arbitration for ALL the crimes which Painewebber does to anyone.

Painewebber does not seem to recognize any of our laws as being laws which apply to Painewebber Incorporate and considers VILE, unlawful deceit done by Painewebber as being exceptable business practices for PWI's business; also PWI insists that CRIMES done by them are disputable and calls them "disputes"; also Painewebber Inc. insists our laws governing the brokerage business are NOT laws applying to Painewebber's brokerage business.

Painewebber Inc. is using the PWI's "Clients Agreement" contract for the egregious crimes of depriving their victims of crimes of their legal rights to be protected by our laws which is deliberate DEPRAVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS; the NASD arbitration is used by PWI for aiding Painewebber in the DEFRAUDING of Painewebber's victims, then NASD arbitration aids PWI in the PROMOTION of their CRIMES by ruling ALIVE claims as STALE infavor of the criminal Painewebber Inc. depriving Painewebber victims receiving any of justice.

The issues governing the October 17, 1994 order and April 10, 1997 Order of the U. S. Ninth Appellate Court are GROSS depravation of civil rights done to me, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per continually by CORPORATE criminal Painewebber Inc. who has continually violated ALL the laws governing their business with me including the TRUTH that Painewebber VIOLATED ALL OUR LAWS including that PWI wrote unlawful sales contracts with me on August 27, 1986 and May 6, 1987 being Painewebber CA CONTRACT crimes filed June 22, 1990 in Kern County Court that are protected by California laws and California Civil Code of Procedure Section 337.

California Civil Code of Procedure HAS a FOUR year statute of limitations; on June 22, 1990 I filed Painewebber's California crimes for writing unlawful sales contracts in California in a four year statute of limitations claim in Kern County against Painewebber Inc. for violating California laws with me and this very alive very legally filed claim against the criminal Painewebber Inc. HAS NEVER BEEN ADDRESSED because of Painewebber has deprived me of MY civil rights of having the VERY very alive legally filed Painewebber Inc. California crimes of writing UNLAWFUL sales contracts in California heard anywhere because of Painewebber GROSS civil rights violations of our laws done to me by PWI to deprive me of MY civil and legal rights, DONE by the criminal PWI using the Federal

Arbitration Laws for the promotion of the criminal acts of the criminal Painewebber Inc., Painewebber's very alive legally filed California crimes of writing unlawful sales contracts in the state of California with me are protected by California Civil Code of Procedure Section 337 and were filed for hearing with the NASD on Dec. 17 and 18, 1991 with March 15, 1991 filed NASD 91 00986 claim but on Nov. 20, 1991 Painewebber Inc. ANNOUNCED at NASD 91 00986 that PWI did not want Painewebber CA contract crimes heard with NASD 91 00986 at the NASD scheduled Dec. 17 and 18, 1991 hearing for ALL of Painewebber's very alive NASD 91 00986 filed Painewebber crimes; all the PWI crimes were scheduled by the NASD on October 23, 1991 for hearing & were very alive ~~on~~ PWI crimes on 12/9/91 when the NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 was fraudulently dismissed as stale and with prejudice by the NASD inorder to DEFRAUD me; the wrongful dismissal of NASD 91 00986 has distroyed my life, health & the lives of my enitre family costing everyone many many thousands of dollars & allowed PWI to use the process of law for crime for 6 years degrading the dignity of our judicial process.

2. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On April 12, 1990 I learned that Painewebber Inc. was a criminal prior to April 12, 1990 I did not KNOW that Painewebber was a CRIMINAL who violated our laws, if I had KNOWN before April 12, 1990 that Painewebber Inc. was violating our laws I would have ASKED Painewebber Inc. for restitution for their crimes done to me PRIOR to April 13, 1990.

On April 30, 1990 I wrote Painewebber's head Corporate Executive Office Mr. Donald Marron a certified letter telling Painewebber's head Corporate Executive Officer Mr. Marron that Painewebber Inc. had violated the laws governing Painewebber's business with me.

On May 31, 1990 Painewebber's Consumers Affairs Office wrote me a letter and told me that PWI's head C. E. O. Mr. Marron, the president of Painewebber Inc. Mr. Marron had received MY letter and Painewebber was investigating MY complaints against Painewebber.

CA court records FO 18582 com. case FO 17864 pg. 137.

The May 31, 1990 dated Painewebber Consumers Affairs letter tells me to contact a "Beverly Williams" allious "B. C. W." Painewebber Consumers Affairs Specialist concerning questions about the letter of May 30, 1990, SERVED to B. C. W., PWI Weehawken N.J. office.

On April 30, 1990 I had written Painewebber's head C. E. O Mr. Marron telling Painewebber's head C. E. O that HE had crime in his corporation and that I was a victim of their crimes and I wanted restitution for being a victim of PWI's crimes and if I did not get restitution for being a victim of PWI's crimes I would be suing Painewebber FOR the DAMAGES of BEING a VICTIM of Painewebber crimes and PWI could have settled their crimes for practically nothing when they were FIRST asked to make restitution and AVOIDED having the world know that they were dishonest with me.

June 8, 1993, I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per filed Civil Rights claim CV F 93 5370 REC. because PWI used ME again & the process of LAW again for promoting PWI's crimes; Oct. 15, 1991 I filed Civil Rights Claim 17864 because PWI knew their employees who violated ME should have been under monitor because PWI knew NASD had centured them for not conducting business properly on Nov. 14, 1985 a FACT I learned from the NASD March 1, 1991; PWI knowingly FAILED to monitor an employee & office who PWI knew had VIOLATED laws governing PWI's business with Me, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per.

In April 1990 I wrote the California Department of Justice and told them that Painewebber Inc. had violated our laws with me and the California Department of Justice told me to contact the Nebraska Banking Authorities concerning Painewebber's crimes done to me at the Painewebber Lincoln, Nebraska office of Painewebber.

SEE Court Records for 6/22/90 filed California claims, CA court records FO 18582 Com. FO 17864 pgs. 298 - 299

On May 31, 1990 Painewebber wrote me a letter telling me that Painewebber was investigating into my problems of Painewebber Inc. violating the laws with me, on June 19, 1990 Painewebber sent me a letter ~~and~~ to me the Nebraska Banking authorities a letter that was full of LIES; the June 19, 1990 letters of PWI to me & the Nebraska Banking Authorities were vile deliberate LIES told to us for covering up PWI crimes; Painewebber Inc. had NOT done a "through investigation" completed on June 19, 1990 because if this was TRUE Painewebber WOULD know that they HAD violated our laws and that PWI DID violate state LAWS, that PWI did violate federal LAWS and that PWI did violate their regulatory LAWS all with me.

Painewebber told the Nebraska Banking Authorities that MY complaining about being violated by PWI was unfounded and that I harassed them; UNFOUNDED when PWI KNEW they had violated the California & Nebraska BLUE SKY LAWS with me on August 27, 1986; not very unfounded being violated by PWI. SEE Court Records for California California Court records FO 18582 Com. FO 17864, Pages 301 through 369 contains undeniable Proof.

Painewebber Inc. SLANDERED me also telling the Nebraska Banking authorities that I, Juanita W. Childs harassed them at Painewebber, this is slander because PWI knew I complained about being violated by Painewebber

because Painewebber Inc. violated our laws; and to complain because of being violated by those who violate our laws to the Nebraska Banking Authorities when PWI most definitely had violated [redacted] laws with me is vicious and a Painewebber LIE; PWI has continually LIED to everyone for years including the Nebraska Banking Authorities in June 1990 that Painewebber did NOT violate laws governing PWI's business; legal documents filed with claims filed against Painewebber Inc. PROVE Painewebber Inc. is a LIER who continually LIED and continually violated me and that Painewebber Inc. is a very horrible vicious corporate criminal who DEPRIVES those who they violate of their legal and civil rights to be protected by our laws who should not be allowed to conduct business in America for the safety of our citizens.

April 30, 1990 I wrote Painewebber's head corporate executive office Mr. Donald Marron and told him by CERTIFIED mail that he had crimes in his company and that I would be suing Painewebber Inc. if I did not get restitution for the crimes that Painewebber Inc. had done to me; Painewebber's head Corporate Executive Office Mr. Donald Marron used his Consumers Affairs Department for doing a COVER UP INVESTIGATION and for deliberately LYING completed on June 19, 1990 confirmed with the June 19, 1990 letter to the Nebraska Banking Authorities who the California Department of Justice had told to contact concerning Painewebber Inc. their crimes done to me while I had an account with them.

Painewebber Inc. continually has LIED to me, LIED to those in authority, lied to those who would have helped me; Painewebber continually LIED to everyone to covered up their crimes and CONTINUALLY DEFIES the existence of OUR laws applying to them; Painewebber was presented the UNDENIABLE evidence that they violated the laws PRIOR TO ME EVER FILING NASD 91 00986

Painewebber defies the existence of our law as laws not applying to their brokerage even when presented the undeniable, uncontestable evidence that on August 27, 1986 Painewebber Inc. was UNLAWFULLY soliciting and selling Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities to me PRIOR to proper registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Painewebber Inc. KNEW that the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities were not registered properly with the Securities & Exchange Commission; PWI knew the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities were not properly registered with the Securities & Exchange on 8/27/1986 and that the securities were illegal for soliciting to anyone UNTIL September 19, 1986; PWI had done a THROUGH investigation completed on June 19, 1990 and Painewebber KNEW they UNLAWFULLY solicited the Mesa Pf "a" limited partnership securities to me on August 27, 1986; also I sent PWI this proof PRIOR to filing NASD 91 00986.

PWI uses NASD arbitration for the promotion of their crimes and demands NASD arbitration continually for using the federal arbitration act for crimes and their crimes deliberately done to me HAVE DISTROYED MY LIFE, HEALTH AND THE LIVES OF MY FAMILY and that cannot be replaced with any amount of money; NOBODY CAN GIVE ME BACK WHAT THE CRIMINAL PWI HAS STOLEN FROM ME AND MY FAMILY.

Painewebber Inc. on August 27, 1986 was unlawfully soliciting and selling Mesa Pf. "a" securities prior to proper registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission to me in California at my Taft, home California; Painewebber used the telephone for making the unlawful sale to me on August 27, 1986 of 1000 shares of Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities and this CRIME is making an unlawful SALES contract in CA and the crime

was filed with the state of CA on June 22, 1990 in a CCP 337 claim having a four year statute of limitation.

Painewebber on August 27, 1986 was violating both California and Nebraska laws with me using the telephone unlawfully at the Lincoln, Nebraska Painwebber Inc. office on August 27, 1986 when Painewebber Inc. was unlawfully soliciting Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities TO ME on August 27, 1986, Painewebber made a very unlawful sale to me by unlawfully selling me ON AUGUST 27, 1986 of the 1000 shares of Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities PRIOR to proper registration with the S. E. C.; this is a VIOLATION of California and Nebraska BLUE SKY LAWS done by Painewebber Inc. being a PWI crime I discovered as a probability on April 12, 1990 and as a FACT on Oct. 30, 1990 that PWI on August 27, 1986 was violating S.E.C. laws, CA & NB blue sky laws DELIBERATELY me viciously because of GROSS PWI greed and for getting an unlawful commission violating deliberately violating me.

The Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities that Painewebber Inc. solicited and sold to me on August 27, 1986 were not properly registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission for solicitation to ANYONE until September 19, 1986 who lived in a state protected by BLUE SKY LAWS, Painewebber Inc. is a criminal who does not conduct business according to OUR laws; Painewebber Inc. has CONTINUALLY DELIBERATELY LIED TO EVERYONE CONTINUALLY for years and years and is a congenital deliberate LIER who should not be allowed to conduct business with anyone because they have NO accountability, are a public menace and use our laws for crime, Painewebber continually has deliberately LIED to everyone continually and refuses to recognize our laws as applying to the PWI brokerage; Painewebber has continually failed to conduct themselves according to our laws.

PWI uses the Federal Arbitration Act for crimes and for unlawfully having their VICTIMS deprive of their civil rights; Painewebber has their victims convicted of being vexatious litigants and sanctioned to PAY Painewebber BIG money by using the Federal Arbitration Act for violating civil rights laws continually.

Painewebber uses the Federal Arbitration Act for violating civil rights laws inorder that their VICTIMS are deprive of a hearing on Painewebber's very alive legally filed crimes filed with the NASD arbitration, Painewebber uses their arbitration clause in their contract for CRIMES and to corrupt the power of law in our United States, Painewebber is a criminal who breaches their corporate obligation contract called "Clients Agreement" inorder to have their victims declared a vexatious litigant, for getting MONEY from their VICTIMS in the form of sanctions for depriving them of their civil rights, Painewebber is the MOST deplorable corporate criminal and a corporate criminal who needs to be PROSECUTED.

Crime and corruption happened to me continually at Painewebber, continually Painewebber deprived me of the protection of the laws governing their business and continually FAILED to conduct themselves according to the laws governing their business with me, court documents filed with my complaints against Painewebber prove ALL of Painewebber's horrible crimes and HORRIBLE LIES.

Painewebber Inc.'s head corporate executive officer Mr. Donald Marron is party to Painewebber's crimes and NEEDS to be prosecuted for promoting the crimes of Painewebber Inc. by using Painewebber's Consumers Affairs Department and Painewebber's Legal Department for OBSTRUCTING justice and covering UP vicious, deliberate Painewebber crimes done to me like the June 19, 1990 "through investigation" into the fact that Painewebber was unlawfully soliciting and selling me Mesa Pf. "a" limited

partnership securities to me that were not properly registered with the Securities & Exchange Commission, being a PWI crimes I learned Painewebber had POSSIBLY done to me on April 12, 1990 being the very first time I ever heard the words BLUE SKY LAWS told me as a possibility on April 12, 1990 by the attorney who told me that Painewebber Inc. was a dishonest brokerage who was not conducting business according to the laws governing Painewebber's business and that I had until August 27, 1990 to filed Painewebber's 8/27/86 crimes in California....CCP 337

"See Davis, 839 F.2d at 1370";

On November 20, 1991 at NASD arbitration 91 00986 Painewebber's lawyer Mr. Ratchick ANNOUNCED that Painewebber did not want any California crimes filed with NASD 91 00986 heard at the scheduled Dec. 17 & 18, 1991 NASD hearing.

Painewebber did not want any of California crimes of PWI that were filed with NASD 91 00986 to be heard with the NASD arbitration, Painewebber told me and the NASD on Nov. 20, 1991 PWI wanted their many many California crimes of Painewebber filed with NASD 91 00986 that NASD had scheduled for hearing on Dec. 17 and 18, 1991 with NASD 91 00986; PWI very very alive crimes scheduled by NASD for hearing at the scheduled for hearing on Dec. 17 and 18, 1991 NASD hearing.

ON March 15, 1991 I had filed ALL the many many very very alive crimes of Painewebber were legally filed with the NASD arbitration in NASD 91 00986 a very huge legally filed NASD arbitration claim with MANY different days of discovery of PWI crimes; on August 21, 1991 Painewebber unconstitutionally motion the NASD to dismiss all of aline NASD 91 00986 for being STALE when the claim was very alive.

PWI on August 21, 1991 motioned the NASD to dismiss MY very alive claims as being STALE claims inorder to defraud me; on Sept. 26, 1991 PWI threatened the NASD 91 00986 arbitrators to violate MY civil rights.

NASD knew that MY claims filed with NASD 91 00986 had many different days of discovery and that I BY law was a citizen of California & had a legal right to be protected by all of the CA laws and that NASD 91 00986 was a very alive claim when the NASD dismissed NASD 91 00986 on 12/9/91 for stale; PWI violated federal securities laws in a continual pattern of crimes including Oct. 1989.

On October 23, 1991 the NASD arbitration had scheduled a hearing for all of the many alive crimes filed with NASD 91 00986 for hearing Dec. 17 and 18, 1991.

PWI did not want to attend THIS scheduled NASD hearing FOR ALL their many crimes, ALL the crimes done by PWI were filed with March 15, 1991 NASD claim 91 00986; NASD 91 00986 had many different discovery days of Painewebber crimes including Painewebber's March 1, 1991 discovery day of breaches of fiduciary crimes done to me by Painewebber being VERY alive on Dec. 9, 1991 when the NASD UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DISMISSED NASD 91 00986 INORDER TO DEFRAUD ME.

NASD arbitration 91 00986 contained ALL of everyone of the MANY crimes that Painewebber had done to me and was a very HUGE NASD arbitration claim that included many different discovery days of many different very alive crimes that Painewebber had done to me including the PWI March 1, 1991 discovery day PWI received being the NASD telling me that Painewebber KNEW the Lincoln, Nebraska PWI office and employees who violated the laws with me was an office and employee that Painewebber KNEW should have under monitor and watch because PWI knew they had been previously censured by the NASD for

not conducting business according to our laws with the public on Nov. 14, 1985. Rec. 3-1-91 from NASD

On Nov. 20, 1991 PWI told me and NASD attorney Mr. Salem that PWI wanted their CA crimes filed with NASD 91 00986 heard in Ca state court and on Nov. 21, 1991 PWI unlawfully set to motion all PWI's CA NASD filed crimes to be heard in California state court, on Nov. 21, 1991 PWI unlawfully set to motion PWI's CA crimes filed with NASD 91 00986 in Ca state Court to unlawfully claim res judicata and use the Federal Arbitration Act for crimes and depriving me of my legal and civil right to be protected by our laws for VILE crimes that Painewebber had done to me in a continual pattern of crimes.

On Nov. 21, 1991 Painewebber Inc. was in CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT in Kern County Superior Court, Bakersfield, California inorder to use the Federal Arbitration Act for the CRIMES of corrupting our LEGAL PROCESS for the next six years, COSTING EVERYONE TONS OF MONEY & WASTING OUR TIME and for TOTALLY distroying MY life, health, the lives and health of MY family, MAKING my life into a hell.

Painewebber used the FRAUDULENT unlawful dismissal of NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 that they created for the promotion of their criminal conduct continually and is a criminal who uses the Federal Arbitration Act unconstitutionally for distroying the lives of those who they violate.

On Dec. 9, 1991 three NASD arbitrators who knew the LAWS very well and that Painewebber's California crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 were all very alive and that Painewebber's federal securities crimes filed with NASD 91 00986 were ALSO very alive because PWI had violated federal securities laws in a continual pattern of crimes including October 1989 being federal

securities crimes of Painewebber filed with NASD 91 00986 on pages 107 and 108; NASD 91 00986 was ALL very alive on 12/9/1991 a fact known to the NASD 91 00986 arbitrators; the NASD arbitrators also knew that PWI was a congenital LIER and because Painewebber was a lier who LIED to me continually that equitable estoppel should apply to ALL of Painewebber Inc. crimes filed with NASD 91 00986.

The NASD 91 00986 arbitrators KNEW that Painewebber was a congenital LIER who needed to KNOW my worth and my husbands worth as a Painewebber defense for VIOLATING our laws, a criminal who justifies their crimes on the amount of wealth those have who they violate has is a CONGENITAL LIER, because the amount of wealth a victim of criminal Painewebber has does not justify that the criminal Painewebber can violated anyone.

On September 26, 1991 Painewebber wrote a letter to the NASD 91 00986 demanding the NASD must force me to give Painewebber items of my personal business and my husband's business as a Painewebber defense for violating our laws with me and that what we owned being OUR wealth justified that PWI could be a criminal with me and violate me; according to PWI they MUST use for a PWI defense that it is OK to violate those who are not driven to live in poverty by PWI crimes; read the demand for document exchange of Painewebber and I am sure you will agree with me that this is WHY the Painewebber brokerage makes these demands on those who they violate.

Claim CV F 93 5370 REC. was filed June 8, 1993 because the criminal Painewebber on September 1, 1992 unlawfully had me convicted of being a vexatious litigant and sanctioned by the court to pay the criminal PWI big bucks; I AM NOT A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT CONFIRMED BY THE CALIFORNIA FIFTH APPELLATE COURT on October 27, 1994 in a document

suitable for publishing; I filed the CIVIL RIGHTS claim June 8, 1993 because the criminal PWI filed unlawful legal documents in CA state court on June 30, 1992 inorder that I would deprive of my legal right to be protected by laws.

On Dec. 9, 1991 three NASD arbitrators who Painewebber most probably BOUGHT unlawfully dismissed the very very very alive NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 in it's entirety to DEFRAUD me inorder that PWI could claim res judicata FRAUDULENTLY.

The NASD arbitration is being used for CORRUPTING the process of law by corporate criminals, I have filed two NASD arbitration claims and both of my NASD arbitration claims have been FRAUDULENTLY dismissed by the NASD.

Painewebber was in criminal contempt when they petitioned the Federal Court for NASD arbitration on September 24, 1990 to use NASD 91 00986 for the promotion of PWI crimes and when PWI failed to WRITE the order of WHAT the Federal court ordered Painewebber to write for the order for NASD 1995 as to what could be HEARD at NASD 1995 being an ORDER given to PWI at the Federal Court Dec. 5, 1994 hearing granting PWI arbitration only for VALIDATING the legality of the STATUTE of limitations for PWI's Federal Securities crimes remanded back to the U. S. DISTRICT Court by the U. S. 9th Circuit Appellate Court in their Nov. 1993 memorandum for CV F 90 450 REC.

PWI used NASD arbitration 91 00986 for having me unlawfully convicted of being a vexatious litigant, and for receiving money from me UNLAWFULLY in the form of sanctions granted to PWI for using the Sept. 24, 1990 Federal Court granted NASD arbitration for the promotion of the crimes of PWI at the NASD where PWI continually failed to conduct themselves according to NASD rules and

did not file ANY submission form for NASD 91 00986 as is required by NASD rules.

PWI continually has failed to conduct themselves according to our rules and laws and uses the process of law for corrupting our legal process and violating civil rights laws.

PWI uses the NASD for receiving money in the form of sanctions from our courts from their victims who they have deprive of justice at the NASD arbitration and who want a hearing on NASD filed crimes of PWI that PWI did not want heard with the NASD arbitration.

PWI has victims convicted of being a vexatious litigant for wanting to have a hearing on the alive crimes that the criminal Painewebber Inc. has done that are filed with the NASD arbitration that PWI sets to motion in a court of law inorder that the NASD arbitration where the ALIVE crime of PWI is located is fraudulently dismissed by the NASD; Painewebber unlawfully solicits investments to people to get commission money for Painewebber Inc. from those who they violate by soliciting and selling investments in violation with our laws, getting money from people by cheating people and VIOLATING our laws, this is what PWI does and PWI sell people horrible investments inorder to have plenty of investments for SHORTING the market.

Painewebber needed eight (8) months to send me MY shares of Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities; for PWI to hold MY securities that I wanted in MY possession for eight (8) months when I wanted these securities held at Painewebber in MY possession at MY home is a PWI crime of FELONY under California laws and U. S. Federal laws.

Painewebber knowingly violates our laws and condones their crimes with the public as being the way Painewebber can do business with the public and when PWI is confronted by their victims about their crimes PWI

defies the existence of our laws as being laws that apply to the Painewebber brokerage.

I learned PWI was a criminal on April 12, 1990 and on April 13, 1990 I told Painewebber that I wanted restitution for being violated by them and that if I did not get restitution for the crimes they had done to me I would be SUING Painewebber for violating me.

PWI VIOLATED me and that is an undeniable fact of truth and legal documents filed with MY claims prove that Painewebber is a criminal who has continually violated our laws with me.

Painewebber continually defies the existence of our laws and COVERS UP THEIR CRIMES, and lies to the authorities telling everyone that Painewebber does not violate our laws when Painewebber has violated all the laws governing their business with me.

PWI has continually been LYING to everyone, continually to everyone, in our courts, in legal documents, LYING all the time, PWI is a horrible public menace; legal documents prove this as being a fact filed with MY claims; PWI has continually covered up their Painewebber crimes done to me, the through investigation of June 19, 1990 PROVES Painewebber knew that on August 27, 1986 violated the California and Nebraska Blue Sky laws and UNLAWFULLY SOLICITED SECURITIES to me prior to proper registration with the Securities & Exchange Commission; on August 27, 1986 the Mesa Pf. "a" securities were not registered for soliciting in California or Nebraska; on August 27, 1986 the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities were NOT properly registered with the S. E. C. for soliciting to anyone who lives in a state protected by BLUE SKY LAWS because the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities were unlawful for PWI to be soliciting until September 19, 1986; this was a fact that

Painewebber KNEW for sure on June 19, 1990 that on August 27, 1986 Painewebber was UNLAWFULLY SOLICITING MESA PF. "a" limited partnership securities to me in violation with BLUE SKY LAWS.

On April 12, 1990 I learned as a possibility that the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities Painewebber solicited and sold to me on 8/27/86 POSSIBLY were securities that were not properly registered with the S. E. C. when they were sold to me by PWI.

The securities attorney in Sacramento, Ca told me HE thought this because PWI had never provide me any disclosure and securities attorney thought possibly PWI was selling me securities that were not properly registered with the S.E.C.; He told me that if PWI was selling securities that were not properly registered with the S.E.C. that PWI was violating CA blue sky laws; April 12, 1990 I learned as a possibility that PWI possibly had sold me the Mesa Pf. "a" securities in violation with Ca blue sky laws.

Prior to April 12, 1990 I had never heard the words "blue sky laws" refered to any securities or the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities that the lawyer thought PWI had possibly sold to me in violation with proper registration laws of the Securities Exchange Commission being a CRIME I DISCOVERED as a possibility on April 12, 1990 the day I learned the words "BLUE SKY LAWS", prior to April 12, 1990 I has never heard the words blue sky laws in MY life; THEN to learn as a FACT on October 30, 1990 that the Mesa Pf. "a" securities were not properly registered with the S. E. C. being a PWI crime confirmed on October 30, 1990 when I was able to get the proof of PWI's crimes of unlawfully selling me the Mesa Pf. "a" prior to proper registration with the S. E. C. on August 27, 1986; the Mesa pf. "a" securities were not properly registered until September 19, 1986 with the S. E. C.

A. December 5, 1994

On Dec. 5, 1994 the Federal Court AGAIN granted Painewebber another NASD arbitration because on October 19, 1994 Painewebber inc. INORDER TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE and delay the finalizing of ALL the crimes PWI had done to me, PWI crimes which I had petitioned for wanting heard in the U. S. Supreme Court on September 12, 1994

On Oct. 19, 1994 when PWI filed a motion for another NASD arbitration for CV F 90 450 REC. the criminal PWI KNEW that all of PWI's crimes had been petitioned to the United States Supreme Court for being FINALIZED, this is WHY Painewebber obstructed justice on October 19, 1994 when Painewebber Inc. petitioned the Federal court that the FEDERAL SECURITIES CRIMES ruled legally ALIVE and filed with CV F 90 450 REC. by the U. S. Federal Ninth Appellate Court on Nov. 1993 were Painewebber crimes that the NASD arbitration by law MUST confirm as being ALIVE PWI federal securities crimes filed with CV F 90 450 REC.

On Oct. 19, 1994 PWI filed a motion in U. S. District Court inorder to obstruct justice AGAIN with CV F 90 450 REC., on Dec. 5, 1994 Painewebber mandated the U. S. Federal Court to grant PWI another NASD arbitration for VALIDATING THE LEGALITY OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS which had been validated by the U. S. Ninth Circuit Court as being filed with CV F 90 450 REC. and very alive PWI Federal Securities crimes filed with July 17, 1990 filed U. S. District Court Federal Securities fraud claim CV F 90 450 REC.
Exhibit A

Considering that the Ninth Appellate Court justices had read until pages 28 and 29 it stands to reason that the Ninth

Appellate Court justices had READ page three (3) confirming the "some year later" as being April 1989 written on Page 3 stated on page three (3) of July 17, 1990 filed CV F 90 450 REC. and being a very alive PWI federal securities crime filed with CV F 90 450 REC. and a very alive PWI federal securities crime known TO everyone.

On July 17, 1990 when CV F 90 450 REC. was filed the legal statute of limitations for federal securities crimes was five (5) years; on Dec. 19, 1991 the enactment of Federal Deposit Insurance Act Section 476 changed the LAWS for PWI Federal Securities crimes done to me as is the LAWS of the state of California for any crime of FRAUD which is FROM the time of discovery, CA civil code procedure Section 338 (4) for PWI securities crimes of the FRAUD filed with CV F 90 450 REC. THIS IS THE LAW for PWI Federal Securities crimes done to me filed with CV F 90 450 REC., crimes done to me before June 19, 1991 MUST be rules according to the CA laws for fraud.

PWI has used the FEDERAL EAST. DISTRICT COURT of California for obstructing justice and delaying the finalizing of CV F 90 450 REC. and PWI must be SEVERELY punished for using the Federal Eastern District Court of Ca and the California COURTS for the promotion of Painewebber criminal conduct DEMANDING arbitration for using arbitration for crime is FRAUD.

B. PWI made a CONTRACT on 12/5/1994

On Dec. 5, 1994 Painewebber Inc. made a CONTRACT with me and Magistrate Dennis L. Beck of U. S. Federal Eastern District Court of California, on Dec. 5, 1994 Painewebber's lawyer Ms Catherine J. Pratt made a VERBALLY contract with U. S. Magistrate Judge Dennis L. Beck and me, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per being that the

FEDERAL court would grant PWI another NASD arbitration ONLY for establishing the legality of the statute of limitations of PWI's crimes remanded back to the district court by the U. S. Ninth Appellate Court in their Nov. 1993 Memorandum for CV F 90 450 REC., this was the ONLY issue that could be addressed at the NASD arbitration granted to PWI on Dec. 5, 1994 and on Dec. 5, 1994 the COURT ordered Painewebber's attorney Ms Catherine J. Pratt to WRITE the order for the NASD 1995 arbitrator of the NASD arbitration 1995 granted to PWI on Dec. 5, 1994 by the U. S. District Court by Magistrate Dennis L. Beck. for NASD 1995 only to validate the legality of the statute of limitations of PWI's securities crimes remanded back to the district court by the U. S. Ninth Circuit Appellate Court in Nov. 1993.

On Dec. 5, 1994 PWI's lawyer Ms Catherine J. Pratt WHEN ordered by the court to write the order of the court for NASD 1995 was with FULL knowledge WHAT was allowed heard at the "1995" NASD arbitration granted to PWI on Dec. 5, 1994 by the federal court WHEN Painewebber's attorney WAS ordered by the Federal court to write a PROPER ORDER for the NASD 1995 arbitrator of NASD arbitration 95 00357, BUT Painewebber's attorney FAILED to write What THE COURT ORDERED heard at 1995 NASD arbitration inorder that CRIMINAL Painewebber could again used another NASD arbitration for promoting PWI crimes and deprive me of my legal and civil rights to be protected by the laws of this land.

C. FACTS

1. PWI uses their arbitration clause in their contract mandating arbitration for CRIMES.

2. The NASD arbitration is PROMOTING the crimes of vile corporate criminals such as Painewebber by failing to rule claims equitably and according to OUR laws.

3. Painewebber uses the mail for the promotion of PWI crimes, continually.

4. Painewebber LIES continually, and Painewebber has violated our laws in a continual pattern of crimes and has degraded our legal process using the Federal Arbitration Act for the promotion of criminal conduct continually.

5. Painewebber's Consumers Affairs Department does COVER UP INVESTIGATION and has LIED to the Nebraska Banking Authorities who the California Department of Justice told me in April 1990 to contact for help concerning ME being violated by Painewebber.

PWI did a cover up THROUGH investigation into the crimes that Painewebber had done to me completed on June 19, 1990 by Painewebber's Consumers Affairs Department, PWI on June 19, 1990 told the Nebraska Banking Authorities and ME a horrible LIE, PWI violated our laws; in May 1990 the California Department of Justice told me to contact the Nebraska Justice Department concerning Painewebber's defiance of the laws governing their violating our laws.

Painewebber's crimes are COVERED UP by PWI's head Corporate Executive Officer Mr. Donald Maron who uses his Consumers Affairs Department for covering UP Painewebber's crimes done to the public.

6. Painewebber's head Corporate Executive Officers is party to the crimes done to me by Painewebber because he had his Consumers Affairs Department do the COVER UP INVESTIGATION completed on June 19, 1990.

The corporate officers of Painewebber use the process of our laws for the promotes of the criminal conduct of Painewebber employees; the Painewebber corporation uses it's employees for crimes and their corporate officers as TOOLS for obstructing justice.

Painewebber uses their corporate executive officers, consumers affairs department, legal department and other employees in their corporation for DEPRIVING victims of their vile deliberate crimes of having JUSTICE for being a victim of the CRIMINAL Painewebber.

D. I HAVE BEEN DENIED JUSTICE

In October 1994 I was deprive of MY legal rights with claim CV F 93 5370 REC. which is Ninth Appellate Court claim 93 16337; the October 17, 1994 order of the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court was appealed on October 24, 1994 with the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court BECAUSE I was unable to go forward with the Petition for Writ of Certiorari UNTIL now because Painewebber on October 19, 1994 had petitioned for STAYING all of the many crimes that the criminal Painewebber Inc. had done to me UNTIL THE NASD COULD VALIDATE THE LEGALITY OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON PWI's CRIMES REMANDED BACK TO THE DISTRICT COURT in the Nov. 1993 Memorandum for CV F 90 450 REC. being a legality of statute of limitations that had ALREADY BEEN ESTABLISHED by the U. S. Ninth Appellate Court and by COURT RECORDS AS BEING VERY ALIVE PWI FEDERAL SECURITIES CRIMES filed legally with CV F 90 450 REC. that had been wrongfully dismissed as being stale because of Painewebber Inc. crimes; the true fact that PAInewebber was petitioning the Federal District Court for another NASD arbitration for deliberately delaying justice and to cause me to be DEPRIVED of going forward with the Writ of Certiorari UNTIL NOW .

This is a PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI for both the October 17, 1994 order and the February 20, 1997 order of the United States Ninth Appellate Court.

The lawyers of CRIMINALS cannot file unlawful legal documents in our courts for corrupting justice such as PAINEWEBBER did on October 19, 1994 for causing costly delays in finalizing claims filed with a court of law; the lawyers of criminals cannot use the Federal Arbitration Act for the promotion of Painewebber's crimes with the public and for obstructing justice such as Painewebber has continually done to me, PWI was in criminal contempt of court in Kern County Superior Court on November 21, 1991 when PWI unlawfully set to motion PWI Ca crimes filed with NASD 91 00986 that PWI did not want heard at the scheduled NASD Dec. 17 & 18, 1991 hearing.

Painewebber Inc.'s lawyer RATCHICK was in CRIMINAL CONTEMPT of court in Kern County on Nov. 21, 1991 inorder to be able to file unconstitutional legal documents in Kern County on June 30, 1992 which were filed by PWI's legal department unlawfully and are unconstitutional legal documents Painewebber filed in Kern County Superior Court for receiving MONEY unlawfully from me and for USING the Kern County Superior Court, Bakersfield, California for very vicious crimes of UNCONSTITUTIONALLY having me convicted as being a vexatious litigant and for receiving money for PWI by violating our laws; also on July 1, 1992 Painewebber told the California Fifth Appellate Court that PWI wanted a SETTLEMENT hearing with me when on June 30, 1992 they had filed UNLAWFUL DOCUMENTS in Kern county Superior Court for unlawfully having me declared as a vexatious litigant and to receive money from me for being a VILE criminal.

Lawyers who defend criminals cannot also become criminals and use the process of law for criminal conduct.

PWI cannot be THREATENING NASD arbitrators such as PWI did with their September 26, 1991 letter. Painewebber cannot have people unlawfully convicted of being A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT BY CORRUPTING THE PROCESS OF LAW.

I AM NOT A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT, THIS HAS BEEN CONFIRMED BY THE CALIFORNIA FIFTH APPELLATE COURT with a document suitable for publishing; the lawyers of criminals cannot FILE MOTIONS for violating people or FOR UNLAWFULLY HAVING PEOPLE CONVICTED OF BEING VEXATIOUS LITIGANT such as criminal Painewebber has done with me; I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per am the VICTIM OF VERY SERIOUS CRIMES done to me by Painewebber a criminal and I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per am petitioning the two (2) orders of the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court denying me rehearing for MY two very alive lawful claims filed with the United States Eastern District Court of California to the United States Supreme court for finalizing and for receiving justice for being a victim of the corporate criminal Painewebber Inc.

On July 17, 1990 I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per legally filed it CRIMES of federal securities fraud against Painewebber in Federal court claim CV F 90 450 REC. because the criminal PWI was threatening ME to remove MY June 22, 1990 filed California Civil Code of Procedure Section 337 claim from the Kern County Municipal Court; the Federal court knows that claim CV F 90 450 REC. IS ALSO Ninth Circuit Appellate Court Claim 92 16894.

The Federal Court also knows that because of Painewebber unlawfully having me convicted of being a vexatious litigant on September 1, 1992 and sanctioned by the Kern County court to pay Painewebber big bucks for depriving me of MY civil rights on Sept. 1, 1992 being WHY on June 8, 1993 I filed $72 million dollar CIVIL

RIGHTS CLAIM CV F 93 5370 REC. the claim that is also Ninth Circuit Court claim 93 16337.

This is Writ of Certiorari for the Ninth Circuit Appellate courts orders of October 17, 1994 and February 20, 1997.

3. REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

1. Laws must be made that criminals cannot be using mandatory arbitration clauses in contracts for depriving victims of crimes of having those who violate our laws prosecuted.

2. Corporate violators of our laws who use arbitration for CRIME must be severely prosecuted ~~before~~ quickly by our courts and their victims must not be made to suffer for years and years such as I have been made to suffer for being a victims of the criminal PWI who has an arbitration clause for promoting their crimes with the public.

3. Arbitration should not be used for DEPRIVING PERSONS' OF THEIR LEGAL RIGHTS TO BE PROTECTED BY OUR LAWS that are written to protect persons of criminals who are violating the written laws such as Painewebber Inc. has used NASD arbitration 91 00986 and 95 00357 to deprive me of the WRITTEN laws of this land that Painewebber Inc. has violated with me in a continual pattern of PWI violating the written laws of our land with me.

4. The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court's order filed October 17, 1994 was on October 24, 1994 ~~was~~ legally FILED as appealed, the fact that PWI stayed their crimes did not deprive me of MY LEGAL rights concerning the October 17, 1994 order of United States Ninth Appellate

Court because I was forced by law not to continue with the writ of certiorari for the Oct. 17, 1994 order until NOW.

The court knows that BY LAW COULD NOT proceed ON to the United States Supreme Court on October 24, 1994 because Painewebber had filed a STAY on all my claims with PWI's petition for STAYING their crimes filed with the United States Eastern District of California Court on October 19, 1994 being a PWI unlawful legal document that prevented me to take the October 17, 1994 filed ORDER of the Ninth Appellate Court to the United States Supreme Court for Petitioning for Writ of Certiorari until NOW.

5. I, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per am petitioning to the United States Supreme Court for BOTH the orders of October 24, 1994 and April 10, 1997.

the U. S. Supreme Court would WANT to grant me, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per a Petition for Writ of Certiorari; the October 17, 1994 order of the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court was appealed on October 24, 1994 at the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court for Civil Rights Claim 93 CV F 537O REC. because Painewebber Inc. on October 19, 1994 HAD FILED A MOTION PETITIONING FOR ANOTHER NASD arbitration in U. S. District Court on October 19, 1994 for July 17, 1990 filed Federal Securities Fraud Claim CV F 90 450 REC. that deprive me of going forward with the WRIT OF CERTIORARI for CV F 93 5370 REC. until now.

October 19, 1994 Painewebber again petitioned the U. S. Federal Court for NASD arbitration for HEARING CLAIMS filed with NASD arbitration 91 00986 that Painewebber Inc. did not want heard at NASD arbitration 91 00986 at the December 17 and 18, 1991 hearing that the NASD had scheduled for hearing ALL of the very alive

crimes of Painewebber filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986.

On October 19, 1994 Painewebber filed a motion in the federal district court for CV F 90 450 REC. staying all MY claims filed against Painewebber Inc. until the federal securities violations of Painewebber Inc. that were reversed by the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court on Nov. 1, 1993 as being very alive Painewebber federal securities violations REVERSED by the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court on page three (3) of July 17, 1990 filed Federal Securities Fraud Claim CV F 90 450 REC. KNOWN as being April 1989 for DISCOVERY of PWI's the May 7, 1987 being ALIVE Federal Securities Fraud crime being a VERY alive securities fraud claim fraudulently dismissed by 3 NASD arbitrators on Dec. 9, 1991 as being a STALE Painewebber securities fraud claim THAT WAS A VERY ALIVE Painewebber securities fraud claim when dismissed by three (3) NASD arbitrators on Dec. 9, 1991 for DEFRAUDING me.

NOTE: The Ninth Appellate Circuit court had read claim CV F 90 450 REC. UNTIL PAGE 29, fact is confirmed by the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court in their Nov. 1, 1993 MEMORANDUM, logic tells us the Ninth Appellate court justices KNEW that April 1989 was the discovery of PWI's May 1987 securities crime, logic tells us the Ninth Circuit Judges had read claim CV F 90 450 REC. atleast UNTIL page 29, the Memorandum confirms they knew that April 1989 was the discovery day for PWI's May 1987 securities crime located on page three (3) of CV F 90 450 REC.

RELIEF REQUESTED

I, Juanita w. Childs, Pro Per ask the United States Supreme court for justice for being a victims of a vicious criminal who has distroyed my health, life and the lives of my family by not conducting business according to our

laws; Painewebber has continually used the United States Federal District Court and the Federal Arbitration ACT for depriving me of justice which has caused the total ruination of MY health, life and the health and lives of my family causing me and my family GROSS suffering and pain for the last seven (7) years; PWI knew in Federal Court on September 24, 1990 that PWI had violated the federal securities laws with me and that going to arbitration for a deliberate, undeniable crime would be wasting everyone's time, money and resources; the continual pursuit of needing to try and get some justice for vile, deliberate crimes done to me by PWI wanting arbitration for promoting CRIMES has caused me to have my LIFE & health completely distroyed, MY husband's LIFE & health distroyed, MY families lives distroyed, PWI KNEW on September 24, 1990 when they demanded at the Federal District court to have arbitration for their crimes of not conducting business that they would be making a very unlawful motion in the U. S. Federal Court, CV F 90 450 REC. is legally filed under the protection of S.E.C. Rule "ii64", on Sept. 24, 1990 the U. S. Federal court KNEW Painewebber was demanding that I Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per would be taking a CRIMINAL LAW SUIT to the NASD arbitration that I wanted PROSECUTED by the court because Painewebber had violated me; Painewebber petitioned the United States Federal Court in August 1990 for arbitrating crimes and Painewebber used the arbitration for DISTROYING my LIFE, costing everyone TONS of money CORRUPTING our process of law for the next seven years, distroying me and my family DELIBERATELY making me & my family live in HELL, viciously using the laws for promoting crime.

Respectfully Submitted by: Juanita W. Childs Pro Per

Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per
329 Parkview Circle,
Taft, California 93268
Date: August 5, 1997

Appendix A--

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUANITA CHILDS, Plaintiff-Appellant	)	No. 92 - 16894
v.	)	
PAINEWEBBER INCORPORATE, Defendant-Appellee	)	

United State Ninth Appellate Court November 8, 1993 filed MEMORANDUM for FEDERAL SECURITIES FRAUD claim CV F 90 450 REC. REVERSING & REMANDING PaineWebber's crimes of federal securities FRAUD of October 1989 on pages 28 & 29 of CV F 90 450 REC. also being filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 on pages 107 & 108 and KNOWN to the three (3) NASD arbitrators who deliberately DEFRAUDED ME on Dec. 9, 1991 when the three NASD arbitrators who KNEW my claim was very alive CRUELLY dismissed NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 AS BEING "STALE" for the very very alive FEDERAL SECURITIES FRAUD crimes of criminal Painewebber and all the other many many many very very very alive California & federal crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim in favor of CRIMINAL and VIOLATOR of our laws Painewebber Inc.

The Ninth Appellate Judges reversed and remanded Painewebber's crimes of federal securities FRAUD crimes filed with CV F 90 450 REC. back to the United States District Court for FURTHER proceedings.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED November 1, 1993
Before: SCHRODER, D. W. NELSON, & THOMPSON, circuit judges of the United States Ninth Appellate Court

NO. "40" COURT RECORD OF CV F 90 450 REC.

The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court ruled CV F 90 450 REC. according to the applicable California laws for fraud stating " In this circuit the limitations period for claims arising under the antifraud provision of the federal securities laws in California begins to run at the same time as does the California period for fraud."

Robuck v. Dean Witter & Co. ., 649 F. 2d 641, 644 (1980).

The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court states on page 3 "alleged violations of section 10 (b) are subject to the three-year statutation for fraud" California Civil Code of Procedure Section 338 (4).

Davis v. Birr, Wilson & Co.,
839 f.2d 1369, 1369-70 (9th Circuit 1988).

"The statute of limitations begins to run when the plaintiff has actual knowledge of the fraud or knowledge of facts sufficient to put a reasonable person on notice."

MY discovery day is April 12, 1990 and it is based upon the discovery that Painewebber had violated our laws & possibly ALSO laws governing registration of securities .

Painewebber did violate our BLUE SKY LAWS with me on 8/27/86 confirmed with facts on October 30, 1990 as being an undeniable crime of our securities laws.

The Ninth Circuit Court judges should have ruled upon this factor also that PWI had violated registration laws a crime with an April 12, 1990 discovery day filed with NASD 91 00986, prior to April 12, 1990 I was totally unaware of laws governing the securities business or that possibly PWI had violated proper registration laws.

Legal court documents filed with CV F 90 450 REC. confirm UNDENIABLY Painewebber Inc. on August 27, 1986 was violating BLUE SKY LAWS in California and Nebraska when PaineWebber Inc. was unlawfully soliciting and selling the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities to me prior to proper registration with the S.E.C. being a PWI securities CRIME I disvoered as a possibility on April 12, 1990.....prior to April 12, 1990 I had neaver heard the words "*blue* sky *laws*" ever in MY life; on October 30, 1991 I learned as a FACT that PWI definately had violated the California & Nebraska Blue Sky Laws with me on August 27, 1986 with the unlawful solicitation and sale of the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities to me that were not PROPERLY REGISTERED for selling or soliciting to anyone UNTIL September 19, 1986

Legally filed with claim CV F 90 450 REC. prior to going to NASD arbitration 91 00986 was legally filed the undeniable PROOF concerning Painewebber's August 27, 1986 UNLAWFUL sale to me of the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities THAT WERE NOT PROPERLY REGISTERED WITH THE SEC on August 27, 1986.

The Mesa Pf. "a" Limited Partnership securities were NOT legal for Painewebber Inc. to be selling & soliciting to me or ANYONE prior to proper registration as PaineWebber Inc. was doing on August 27, 1986 and LYING about the investment to me Juanita W. Childs when they were solicited and sold to me FRAUDULENTLY.

The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court on November 1, 1993 remanded Painewebber's May 1987 federal securities violation crimes with the April 1989 discovery day of April 1989 being on page three (3) is remanded back to the district court claim CV F 90 450 REC. for further finding as to WHEN was "some year later".

On October 26, 1994, Juanita W. Childs, Pro Per confirmed at the MANDATORY SCHEDULING HEARING that the discovery day date for "some year later" was written on page three (3) as April 1989 being the date of April 1989 and that the date of April 1989 for discovery of Painewebber's May 1987 federal securities violations filed with CV F 90 450 REC. was very alive for discovery of the May 1987 for a PaineWebber federal securities violation claim filed with CV F 90 450 REC. on July 17, 1990.

On December 9, 1991 the NASD arbitration fraudulently dismissed NASD 91 00986 causing the fraudulent dismissal of CV F 90 450 REC.

On September 26, 1991 Painewebber Inc. Legal Department had made UNCONSTITUTIONAL demands upon the NASD arbitration 91 00986 claim for violating MY civil rights, Painewebber Inc. claiming that my personal businesss and property WERE a Painewebber defence for violating the laws governing Painewebber's business with me.

MY property and personal business are not a Painewebber Inc. defence for anyone at PaineWebber Inc. to violate me or to violate our laws.

On October 19, 1994 PaineWebber AGAIN had the GAULL to again petitioned the U. S. Federal District court for another NASD arbitration for Painewebber's FEDERAL SECURITIES fraud crimes filed with CV F 90 450 REC. that were remanded back to the Federal Eastern District of California court on Nov. 1, 1993 by the U. S. Ninth Circuit Appellate court being the Painewebber Federal Securities crimes the crimes ruled alive by the Ninth Circuit remanded back to the district court inorder that ALL the other MANY alive crimes of PaineWebber filed with CV F 90 450 REC.

would be addressed in the court but PaineWebber inorder to avoid CONVICTION by the court for their crimes of federal securities fraud filed with CV F 90 450 REC. on October 19, 1994 petitioned the Federal District Court demanding that the NASD arbitration must ACCORDING TO LAW validate the legality of the statute of limitations of PaineWebber's federal securities crimes filed with CV F 90 450 REC. which were FRAUDULENTLY dismissed by the NASD arbitration on Dec. 9, 1991 as being stale Painewebber federal securities crimes, VILE PWI CRIMES that the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court ruled ALIVE federal securities crimes in the MEMORANDUM of the U. S. Ninth Appellate Court on Nov. 1, 1993.

Painewebber on October 19, 1994 AGAIN petitioned AGAIN the U. S. Federal Court inorder that the NASD arbitrators would VALIDATE THE LEGALITY OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS of Painewebber's FEDERAL SECURITIES crimes remanded back to the district court by the U. S. Ninth Circuit Appellate Court filed with CV F 90 450 REC. because Painewebber Inc. does not think that the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court is compedent in knowing the correct law governing the statute of limitations laws governing that govern the securities business of PaineWebber Inc.

Painewebber was with full knowledge on October 26, 1994 that should Painewebber mandated the federal court to grant Painewebber Inc. another NASD arbitration for CV F 90 450 REC. that Painewebber Inc. would be using the Federal Arbitration Act AGAIN for the promotion of PaineWebber Inc. crimes.

PaineWebber Inc. HAS used the United State Eastern District court of California and the NASD arbitration for the promotion of Painewebber crimes with me Juanita W. Childs. Pro PW Continually.

The NASD arbitration is incapable of ruling claims filed with them according to our laws and is continually defrauding victims who are being FORCED by law to use the NASD arbitration for having their claims heard, the NASD arbitration is unlawfully dismissing claims in favor of criminals who support the NASD arbitraton organization & victims of criminal who are mandated to use the NASD arbitration are continually being DEFRAUDED at the NASD arbitration, it happened to me TWICE, with NASD 91 00986 & 95 00357.

According to laws governing arbitration the NASD arbitration does not need to conform to our laws and they do NOT have the power to prosecut criminals who violate our laws and who NEED to be prosecuted.

PaineWebber has used the U. S. Federal Eastern District Court of California for obstruction of justice and using the Federal Arbitration act for crimes with claim CV F 90 450 REC. and for deliberately WASTING everyones resourses, time, money for at least an additional six years.

United States Ninth Appellate in 92 16894 confirms that filed with July 17, 1990 Federal Securities Fraud claim CV F 90 450 REC. LEGALLY on pages 28 and 29 are VERY ALIVE PaineWebber Inc. federal securities crimes filed with CV F 90 450 REC.

The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court on Nov. 8, 1993 REVERSES and REMANDS the October 1989 Federal Securities fraud claims of PaineWebber Inc. that are on pages 28 and 29 of Federal Securities Claim CV F 90 450 REC. and pages 107 and 108 of NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 being PWI alive crimes remanded back to the Federal District Court by the U. S. Ninth Circuit Appellate Court.

The Ninth Circuit appellate Court further rules that further further proceeding in the court are necessary concerning Painewebber's crimes.

The discovery day of Pwi's securities fraud of May 1987 known to the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court justices as being very alvie, legally filed with CV F 90 450 REC. is on page 3 confirmed as April 1989.

The Ninth Circuit ruled that CV F 90 450 REC. must be ruled according to California Civil Code of Procedure 338 (4); page 3 of CV F 90 450 REC.confirming the April 1989 date as the time of discovery for the May 1987 Painewebber VIOLATION of federal securities fraud filed with CV F 90 450 REC.

On Nov. 30, 1993 the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court order of Nov. 1, 1993 was filed with the U. S. Eastern District of California Court claim CV F 90 450 REC. and only those FEDERAL SECURITIES crimes of Painewebber filed with CV F 90 450 REC. were remanded for CV F 90 450 REC. back to the district court to establish the time of "WHEN" was the discovery of "some year later"for the May 1987 PaineWebber Inc. federal securities violation of Painewebber Inc. being written as fact on page three of CV F 90 450 REC. confirming that the correct date of discovery for the May 1987 PaineWebber federal securities crime IS April 1989 for when "some year later" occured.

On October 26, 1994 at the conference hearing for CV F 90 450 REC. I confirmed to the court that the DISCOVERY DAY of PaineWebber's May 1987 securities crime was on page 3 confirmed as APRIL 1989 for discovery of PaineWebber's May 1987 securities crime.

The Federal District court and PaineWebber Inc. had confirmation as to the very alive April 1989 discovery day of Painewebber's May 1987 federal securities violation filed with CV F 90 450 REC. on October 26, 1994.

Appendix B –

MEMORANDUM filed June 28, 1994

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUANITA CHILDS,	)	No. 93 16337
Plaintiff-Appellant	)	
v.	)	
PAINEWEBBER INCORPORATE,	)	
Defendant-Appellee	)	

September 1, 1992 discovery day CIVIL RIGHTS CLAIM

CV F 93 5379 REC. filed June 8, 1993 in the United States Eastern District court of California against PaineWebber.

Appeal from the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, Robert E. Coyle, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 21, 1994

Before: Circuit Judges Tang, Pregerson, and T. G. Nelson

Claim CV F 93 5370 REC. was filed on June 8, 1993 against PaineWebber Inc. because of GROSS CRIMINAL conduct done by PaineWebber to deprive me of MY civil rights.

PaineWebber uses the Federal Arbitration Act unlawfully, for crimes, for getting money unlawfully, for having persons who want their claims heard convicted of being vexatious litigants.

Claim CV F 93 5370 REC. was filed because Painewebber UNLAWFULLY HAD ME SANCTIONED BY THE

COURT AND CONVICTED OF BEING A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1992.

PaineWebber is using our laws unlawfully and depriving those who they violate from their legal and civil rights to be protected by our laws.

MEMORANDUM FILED JUNE 28, 1993.

Robuck v. Dean Witter & Co. ., 649 F. 2d 641, 644 (1980).

Davis v. Birr, Wilson & Co.,
839 f.2d 1369, 1369-70 (9th Circuit 1988).

"The statute of limitations begins to run when the plaintiff has actual knowledge of the fraud or knowledge of facts sufficient to put a reasonable person on notice."

The U. S. Ninth Appellate Court upheld the U. S. District court's ruling of being "res judicata" to Federal Securities Fraud claim CV F 90 450 REC. for the September 1, 1992 discovery day civil rights crimes of Painewebber Inc. filed with CV F 93 5370 REC. of unlawfully having me convicted of being a VEXACIOUS LITIGANT for wanting a hearing on Painewebber's California crimes of writing UNLAWFUL SALES CONTRACTS with me on August 27, 1986 and violating California BLUE SKY laws in California being a crime of Painewebber that I discovered as a possibility on April 12, 1990.

On Nov. 20, 1991 Painewebber told the NASD arbitraton that PaineWebber Inc. wanted their California crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 that were scheduled for hearing with the NASD arbitration on Dec. 17 and 18, 1991 were PWI crimes that PWI wanted heard in California state court KNOWING that California

laws mandated arbitration for all of PWI's California crimes because of Painewebber's arbitration clause in the PWI opening account agreement contract.

On Nov. 21, 1991 PaineWebber Inc. Legal Department who knew the California laws mandating arbitration for all of PWI's California crimes being in CRIMINAL CONTEMPT of court in Kern County Superior Court, Bakersfield, California unlawfully set to motion PWI's March 1, 1991 discovery day California crime of breach of a corporate obligation contract crime filed with NASD arbitration 91 00986 until Dec. 9, 1991 unlawfully set to motion by PWI legal department in California on November 21, 1991.

Painewebber Inc. on Nov. 21, 1991 unlawfully set to motion all the California crimes of Painewebber Inc. filed with NASD arbitration 91 00986 that were scheduled for hearing with the NASD arbitration on December 17 and 18, 1991 to unlawfully claim res judicata, have me convicted of being a vexatious litigant and sanctioned to pay the criminal Painewebber Inc. BIG money and corrupt the process the process of law for the next six years.

Claim CV F 93 5370 rec. was legally filed on June 8, 1993 because Painewebber Inc. unlawfully had me convicted of being a vexatious litigant and sanctioned to pay PWI big money and this claim is not RES JUDICATA to any claim any where, the claim was filed in Federal Court on June 8, 1993 because PaineWebber Inc. is a very vicious criminal who needs to be severely prosecuted by everyone; the decision of Ninth Circuit Appellate Court for the September 1, 1992 discovery day of Federal Eastern District Court CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS claim CV 93 5370 REC. as being res judicata to CV F 90 450 REC. was affirmed with Ninth Circuit Appellate court claim 93 16337 submitted on June 21, 1993.

Appendix C --

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUANITA CHILDS,	)	No. 93 16337
Plaintiff-Appellant	)	
v.	)	
PAINEWEBBER INCORPORATE,	)	
Defendant-Appellee	)	

ORDER FILED OCT. 17, 1994

For CIVIL RIGHTS claim CV F 93 5370 REC. filed June 8, 1993 with U. S. East. District Court of California, Chief Justice Robert E. Coyle presiding.

Before: Tang, Pregerson, and T. G. Nelson, Circuit Judges.

"The Panel has voted to deny appellant's petition for rehearing and to reject the suggestion for rehearing en banc.

"The full court has been advised of the suggestion for rehearing en banc and no active judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter enbanc."

On September 12, 1994 I had written to ALL the appellate courts where PaineWebber's crimes are filed and requested from the courts for the RIGHT FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI a fact known to the judges being the reason the rehearing was denied by the judges of the United States Ninth Appellate on October 17, 1994.

"The statute of limitations begins to run when the plaintiff has actual knowledge of the fraud or knowledge of facts sufficient to put a reasonable person on notice."

Appendix D --

FIFTH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEALS

JUANITA CHILDS, Plaintiff-Appellant	)	No. FO 18582
v.	)	
PAINEWEBBER INCORPORATE, Defendant-Appellee	)	

FROM: Kern County Superior Court
Judge Robert T. Baca

Before: Fifth Appellate Court Juges, Buckley, Harris & Martin; Judge Martin acting as the presiding judge.

OPINION:

The Opinion os dated Oct. 27, 1994 and is 27 pages long and suitable for publishing.

Disposition

"That part of the order sustaining demurrer without leave to amend which awards sanctions to defendant is reversed and remanded to the trial court to either (1) enter a new sanctions order according with the Code of Civil Procedure section 128.5, subdivision (c) or in the alternative, (2) vacate the imposition of sanctions."

"The trial court's order determining vexacious litigation and awarding sanctions is reversed and remanded to the trial court for further proceedings and hearing in accordance with the findings and conclusions expressed herein."

"Each side to bear it's own costs of appeal"

PaineWebber Inc. NEAVER FILED ANY APPEAL to the California Fifth Appellate Court's October 27, 1994 OPINION that is 27 pages long and suitable for publishing, Painewebber Inc. has had MORE than ampel time to appeal the October 27, 1994 California Fifth Appellate Court ruling but they have neaver ever filed anything, infact NOBODY of the PaineWebber Inc. legal department lawyers assigned to my very alive and neaver ever heard California legally filed CLAIMS against the criminal PaineWebber appeared in PERSON at the Kern County District Court hearing for this subject and the FACT that PaineWebber Inc. had been in criminal contempt of court in Kern County on November 21, 1991 when PaineWebber unlawfully set to motion PaineWebber's California crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 that the NASD had scheduled for hearing on Dec. 17 & 18, 1991, being vile PaineWebber crimes of the state of California that Painewebber told the NASD arbitration 91 00986 on Nov. 20, 1991 were CRIMES that Painewebber wanted heard in California State Court being ALIVE PWI crimes unlawfully set to motion by Painewebber in California state court on Nov. 21, 1991 inorder to unlawfully claim "res judicata".

On November 21, 1991 PaineWebber Inc. being in CRIMINAL CONTEMPT OF COURT in Kern county Superior court, Bakersfield, California unlawfully set to motion VERY ALIVE NASD 91 00986 FILED California crimes of criminal PaineWebber that were SCHEDULED FOR HEARING with NASD 91 00986 on Dec. 17 and 18, 1991 inorder to CORUPT THE PROCESS OF LAW in the state of California for the NEXT six (6) YEARS and cost me, the state of California and the Federal Government a TON of money unecessarily; PaineWebber Inc. is using the FEDERAL ARBITRATION ACT for CRIMES and violating civil rights laws inorder that their VICTIMS are deprived of their legal and civil rights.

Appendix E--

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUANITA CHILDS,	)	No. 96 16 169
Plaintiff-Appellant	)	
v.	)	Filed 2/20/97
PAINEWEBBER INCORPORATE,	)	
Defendant-Appellee	)	

From: U. S. East. Dist of California SECURITIES FRAUD
July 17, 1990 filed CV F 90 450 REC.

United State Ninth Appellate Court MEMORANDUM
Submitted February 18, 1997

2ND U. S. NINTH APPELLATE COURT
MEMORANDUM for FEDERAL SECURITIES FRAUD
claim CV F 90 450 REC.

Before: Alarcón, Canby, and Tashima, Circuit Judges.

> "This court may not review the merits
> but must ask only weather the grievience
> is governed by the contract and weather
> the parties agreed to arbitrate the dispute."

NO AGREEMENT WAS EVER MADE FOR
ARBITRATING ANY ACT WHICH IS AN ACT OF
CRIMES BY ME, Juanita W Childs, Pro Per.

> "an award will not be set a side unless
> it manifests a complete disregard for the
> law. See interpretations of the laws." A. G. Edward
> & Sons, Inc. v. McCollough, 967 F.2d 1401, 1402
> (9th Cir. 1992) (per curiam)"

The Ninth Appellate court for CV F 90 450 REC. on Nov. 1, 1993 in Ninth Appellate court Claim 92 16894 REVERSED and REMANDED PaineWebber's crimes of federal securities FRAUD of October 1989 on pages 28 & 29 of CV F 90 450 REC. also being filed with NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 on pages 107 & 108 and KNOWN to the three (3) NASD arbitrators who deliberately DEFRAUDED ME on Dec. 9, 1991 when the three NASD arbitrators who KNEW my claim was very alive CRUELLY dismissed NASD arbitration claim 91 00986 AS BEING "STALE" for the very very alive FEDERAL SECURITIES FRAUD crimes of criminal Painewebber and all the other many many many very very very alive California & federal crimes filed with NASD arbitration claim in favor of CRIMINAL and VIOLATOR of our laws Painewebber Inc.

The Ninth Appellate Judges reversed and remanded Painewebber's crimes of federal securities FRAUD crimes filed with CV F 90 450 REC. back to the United States District Court for FURTHER proceedings that were remanded back to the NASD arbitration for validation of the legality of the statute of limitations ONLY by the Federal District court on Dec. 5, 1994.

THE ORDER CONTRACT FOR NASD 95 00357 was only for the NASD ARBITRATOR to VALIDATE the legality of the STATUTE of LIMITATIONS for only PWI's FEDERAL SECURITIES CRIMES REMANDED BACK to the District Court by theNinth Circuit Appellate Court in their MEMORANDUM for CV F 90 450 REC. submitted Nov. 1, 1993 before Judges Schroder, D. W. Nelson and Thompson, circuit judges of the United States Ninth Appellate Court who ruled PWI violated federal securities laws with me and that they were alive and filed with July 17, 1990 filed LEGALLY as alive federal securities fraud crimes with the Federal Court fraudulently dismissed. NO. "40" COURT RECORD OF CV F 90 450 REC.

The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court ruled CV F 90 450 REC. according to the applicable California laws for fraud stating " In this circuit the limitations period for claims arising under the antifraud provision of the federal securities laws in California begins to run at the same time as does the California period for fraud."

Robuck v. Dean Witter & Co. ., 649 F. 2d 641, 644 (1980).

The Ninth Circuit Appellate Court states on page 3 "alleged violations of section 10 (b) are subject to the three-year statutation for fraud" California Civil Code of Procedure Section 338 (4).

Davis v. Birr, Wilson & Co.,
839 f.2d 1369, 1369-70 (9th Circuit 1988).

"The statute of limitations begins to run when the plaintiff has actual knowledge of the fraud or knowledge of facts sufficient to put a reasonable person on notice."

MY discovery day of LEARNING PaineWebber Inc. is a CRIMINAL is April 12, 1990 and it is based upon the discovery that Painewebber possibly had violated our laws governing proper registration of securities and that PaineWebber wrote UNLAWFUL sales contracts with me.

Painewebber did violate our BLUE SKY LAWS confirmed as a facts on October 30, 1990 when I purchased the undeniable proof that PWI had violated the registration laws soliciting & selling the Mesa Pf. "a" limited partnership securities prior to proper registration on August 27, 1986 to me in violation with proper registration laws MANDATED by the Securities & Exchange Commission.

Appendix F –

ORDER filed April 10, 1997

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUANITA CHILDS,	)	No. 96 16169
Plaintiff-Appellant	)	
v.	)	
PAINEWEBBER INCORPORATE,	)	
Defendant-Appellee	)	

United States Eastern District court of California
FEDERAL SECURITIES FRAUD # CV F 90 450 REC.
filed July 17. 1990 against PaineWebber Incorporate.

Appeal from the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, Robert E. Coyle, Chief Judge, Presiding

ORDER

Filed April 10, 1997

Before: Circuit Judges Alarcón, Canby and Tashima.

Petition for rehearing denied.